



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/700,321	01/16/2001	Martin Weston	87805-9016	4846
23409	7590 04/13/2006		EXAMINER	
	BEST & FRIEDRICH,	TRAN, TRANG U		
	ONSIN AVENUE E. WI 53202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Α	pplication No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			9/700,321	WESTON ET AL.					
			xaminer	Art Unit					
		T	rang U. Tran	2622					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appear	s on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence ac	ldress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN Insions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum is tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE s of 37 CFR 1.136(a) munication. tatutory period will a y will, by statute, cau	E OF THIS COMMUNI In no event, however, may a pply and will expire SIX (6) MO se the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this c BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 23 Dece	mber 2005						
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	_								
٠,٣	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)⊠	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
6)⊠									
7)🖂									
8)□									
Applicati	on Papers			٠.					
9)	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim ☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
* 0	application from the Internation	•	` ''						
	See the attached detailed Office action	on for a list of t	ne certified copies not	received.					
Attachmen	t(s)								
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)			Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date	PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application (PTC)-152)				

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

1. After consideration of the Pre-Appeal Brief Request filed Dec. 23, 2005, the finality of the last Office Action has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues, which respect to claim 1 in the pre-appeal brief and in the amendment filed July 7, 2005, that the effect of multiplying signals together is fundamentally different from the effect of adding together signals, each of which has been multiplied by a coefficient (so called weighted addition). Therefore, Chen does not disclose or suggest the claimed step of multiplying together the filtered signals as required by claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that claim 1 recites "multiplying together said three filtered signals to produce an output video signal". The word "together" can be defined in the "Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, tenth edition, as "at one time: SIMULTANEOUSLY". When "together" is interpreted as "simultaneously", the claimed "multiplying together the filtered signals" is anticipated by the multipliers 1006, 1008, 1010 and an adder 1012 of Fig. 8 of Chen (col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/700,321

Art Unit: 2622

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate by Chen et al (US Patent No. 6,335,990 B1).

In considering claim 1, Chen et al discloses all the claimed subject matter, note 1) the claimed comprising the steps of conducting the linear filtering operations on an input video signal to produce filtered signals, linear filtering operation comprising the taking of a weighted sum of pixels is met by the three linear 2-tap recursive filters 1000, 1002, 1004 (Figs. 8-9, col. 7, line 13 to col. 9, line 55), and 2) the claimed three linear filtering operations on an input video signal to produce three filtered signals, and multiplying together said three filtered signals to produce an output video signal is met by the outputs of three linear 2-tap recursive filters multiplies the filtered value by a weighting value and then sums the product for each dimension to provide the new filtered value 708 for a particular pixel (Fig. 8, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 14).

In considering claim 2, the claimed wherein said weighted sum is taken over pixels of the input video signal defined by a filter aperture is met by is met by the three linear 2-tap recursive filters 1000, 1002, 1004 (Figs. 8-9, col. 7, line 13 to col. 9, line 55).

In considering claim 3, the claimed wherein all three linear filtering operations have the same filter aperture is met by the three linear 2-tap recursive filters 1000, 1002, 1004 (Figs. 8-9, col. 7, line 13 to col. 9, line 55).

Art Unit: 2622

In considering claim 4, the claimed wherein for at least one linear filtering operation, the taking of a weighted sum of pixels includes the output pixel of the respective linear filtering operation is met by one of the three linear 2-tap recursive filters 1000, 1002, 1004 (Figs. 8-9, col. 7, line 13 to col. 9, line 55).

In considering claim 6, the claimed said three filtered signals are multiplied together without intervening filtering of the three filtered signals is met by the outputs of three linear 2-tap recursive filters multiplies the filtered value by a weighting value by the multipliers 1006, 1008, 1010 and then sums the product for each dimension to provide the new filtered value 708 for a particular pixel (Fig. 8, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 14).

In considering claim 7, the claimed wherein a further linear filtering operation is conducted in parallel on the input video signal, with the result of said further linear filtering operation being combined with the multiplication product of said three filtered signals to produce an output video signal is met by the three linear 2-tap recursive filters 1000, 1002, 1004 and the adder 1012 (Figs. 8-9, col. 7, line 13 to col. 9, line 55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al (US Patent No. 6,335,990 B1).

Art Unit: 2622

In considering claim 15, Chen et al disclose all the limitations of the instant invention as discussed in claim 1 above, except for providing the claimed wherein a filter is interposed between the output of the second multiplier and said combiner. The capability of using the filter is old and well known in the art. Therefore, the Official Notice is taken. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the old and well known use of a filter interposed between the output of the second multiplier and said combiner into Chen et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal because the filter is used for filtering noises.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Claims 8-14 allowed.

The independent claim 8 identifies the distinct features: "a first multiplier for multiplying together the respectively outputs of the first and second linear filters; and a second multiplier for multiplying together the respective outputs of the first multiplier and the third linear filter to produce an output video signal". The prior arts, Chen et al (US Patent No. 6,335,990 B1), either singularly or in combination, fail to anticipate or render the about underlined limitations obvious.

Art Unit: 2622

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 5, 2006

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER